

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CARLOS ALBERTO LOPEZ MOLINA;  
LETICIA ARELLANO PLIEGO,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-73329

Agency Nos. A95-292-120  
A95-292-121

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 20, 2007\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Carlos Alberto Lopez Molina and Leticia Arellano Pliego petition pro se for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

§ 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen.

*Konstantinova v. INS*, 195 F.3d 528, 529 (9th Cir. 1999). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA considered the evidence petitioners submitted regarding one of their daughters and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law") (internal citation and quotation omitted). Contrary to petitioners' contention, the IJ's interpretation of the hardship standard falls within the broad range authorized by the statute. *See Ramirez-Perez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 1001, 1004-1006 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**